

(62)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
W. P.(S) No. 4738 of 2005

Petitioners

1. Birendra Nath Roy, S/o Shri Ram Janma Roy, Aged about 38 years, Govt. H.S. School, Koilibeda, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
2. Rainoo Ram Hidko, S/o Shri Saradu Ram, aged about 37 years, Govt. H.S. School Koilibeda, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
3. Shambhoolal Dugga, S/o Late Tullu Ram, aged about 36 years, Boys Primary School Koilibeda, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
4. Rohit Kumar Yadav, S/o M.R. Yadav, aged about 34 years, Primary School Chilparas, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
5. Mohit Ram Temoo, S/o Late Mansa Ram, aged about 42 years, Primary School Junagawedegaon, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
6. Kamal Narayan Watti, S/o Shri Lakhma Ram, aged about 37 years, Primary School Kesekodipara, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
7. Ram Narayan Sinha, S/o Late Suk Lal, aged about 37 years, Primary School Panidobir, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
8. Dev Nath Kemro, S/o Shri Pil Sai, aged about 33 years, Primary School Katgaon, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
9. Ray Singh Netam, S/o Shri Sukalu Ram, aged about 41 years, Primary School Alparas, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)
10. Bansoo Ram Netam, S/o Shri Harakh Ram, aged about 33 years, Primary School Udanpur, Block Koilibeda, Distt. Kanker (C.G.)

Versus

Respondents

1. State of Madhya Pradesh, Through the Secretary, Tribal Welfare Department, Bhopal (M.P.)
2. The State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Tribal Welfare Department, Raipur (C.G.)
3. The Commissioner, Tribal Welfare Department, Bhopal (M.P.)
4. The Commissioner, Tribal Welfare Department, Raipur (C.G.)

63

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri

Present: Mr. P.P. Sahu, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Satish Gupta, Dy. Govt. Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORDER(Passed on this 10th Day of April, 2007)

1. The question of law involved herein asto whether the petitioners are entitled to regular pay scale w.e.f. the date of initial appointment or from the date of completion of probation period.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as for the State/respondents jointly submit that the facts and question of law involved the present writ petition are the same to that of in W.P. (s) No. 5976 of 2006 (Sushil Tiwari & others Vs. State Govt. of Chhattisgarh & others), which was allowed vide order dated 7.11.2006.
3. In view of the above-stated submission made by learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is allowed in the same terms. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gowri